

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite subject matter from claim 18, i.e., that the cavity includes a subcavity. The claim also recites in step e that a wall of the subcavity constrains the extent to which an outer periphery of the previously-deposited layer can flow within the subcavity, while enabling the subsequently-deposited layer within the cavity to flow outwardly past the both subcavity and an outer periphery of the previously-deposited layer.

None of the references of record discloses or suggests the presently claimed combination of steps.

Makinson et al. discloses the molding of a white sidewall in a tire, wherein the white color does not fill a mold cavity in which it is positioned. There is no disclosure of the injection molding of plural colors, or the use of a separate insert, or a cavity having a subcavity for receiving multiple rubber layers.

Each of Bohm et al. and DE '572 discloses the molding of a white sidewall in a tire using an insert. It is disclosed to fill the mold cavity (having no subcavity) with the white color (see Bohm et al. at col. 11, lines 4-5; and Fig. 6 of DE '572).

Williams discloses to adhere a multi-color pad to a finished tire and, then cut the indicia into the pad (see col. 2, lines 41-46 and 54-57). There is no disclosure of molding multi-colors in the tire, and thus no disclosure of a cavity/subcavity.

Thus, in sum, there is no disclosure or teaching in the applied prior art of molding a multi-color motif in a tire as recited in claim 12. Moreover, the two patents which teach the use of an insert also teach to fill the mold cavity, rather than having

less volume than the cavity as recited in claim 12. The only teacher of multiple colors teaches to adhere a pad and then cut into the pad.

In effect, the rejection of the claims has been made by picking and choosing form features of the cited prior art and ignoring the contrary teachings of the "teaching" references. That is, the teaching in Bohm et al. and DE '517 of filling the mold cavity when using an insert is ignored, and Williams' teaching of applying multi-colors to a tire by adhering a pad to a finished tire (not molding it in) is ignored.

Nowhere is it explained how an artisan would be motivated to provide a multi-color motif in a tire by a molding operation. Makinson et al., Bohm et al. and DE '517 don't contemplate adding multiple colors to a sidewall, and Williams doesn't contemplate a molding step.

Nowhere is there an explanation as to how to provide a tire with a multi-color motif as presently claimed, namely by using multiple colors whose total volume is less than that of the mold cavity in which they are placed, no reference uses multiple colors in a mold cavity), wherein a subsequently-deposited color projects beyond a previously-deposited color in the mold.

New dependent claim 19 recites that in step (b) the subsequently-deposited layer projects beyond both the subcavity and the previously-deposited layer that is clearly shown in original Fig. 4.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 8, 2007

By:


Alan E. Kopecki

Registration No. 25813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620